

Macau

Past and Present



Centro Científico e Cultural de Macau, I.P.
Ministério da Educação e Ciência



澳門基金會
FUNDAÇÃO MACAU

Lisboa, 2015

The Canton–Macau Area as a ‘*lieu de savoir*’: the Western Missionaries’ Detention in the Canton Jesuit Residence (1665–1671) and their Written and Editorial Output (22/3/2013)

Noël Golvers

The Jesuits’ presence in China in the pre-suppression period, during the late-Ming and Early Qing essentially mainly two centres of scholarly work with considerable continuity viz. Peking – correctly called by C. Jami a ‘*lieu de savoir*’ – and Macau, although the latter was probably mainly a centre of instruction. Anyway, due to the particular circumstances during the Oboi Regency and the result of the trials of the Jesuits, Canton also became, albeit for a short period (1666–1671), a place of intense scholarly activity, with a conspicuous editorial output. In this contribution, I would like to focus on this short period of detention and the texts it produced, also looking at them in the light of inner Chinese communications, and the contacts with Macau and Europe that they reveal, mostly by implication.

Let me start by recalling the material facts and circumstances. After the trials in Peking were finished, 25 missionaries, among them 20 Jesuits, 4 Dominicans and 1 Franciscan, were temporarily banished to Canton, where the *Jesuit residence in the Di liu pu-street* became the scene of a 5-year long detention, a period which witnesses subdivided into three consecutive phases, with an increasing degree of (relatively) free movement.¹ When they arrived in Canton on 25 March 1666,² they apparently found the Jesuit house empty, and without any furniture.³ Shortly after their arrival, and in order to adapt the house to its new function for such a large group, the original residential building

1. According to the reports and descriptions from Canton (in Domingo de Navarrete, pp. 230–233 ed. Cummins) we can accept the following periodisation: (a) from the beginning to June 1668: very hard conditions; (b) from 24 June 1668 to October 1669, some sort of relief with the possibility that the individual missionaries could go out of the house on occasion, although with prudence; (c) since October 1669: greater freedom of movement (see Domingo de Navarrete, pp. 232–233 Cummins). It may be quite revealing that all three of the Apologetic treatises, with rich bibliographic references, were finished within the second period (Prospero Intorcetta: approx. 15 August 1668; Francesco Brancati: finished 25 June 1669; Approb. 4 September 1669; Jacques Lefauve: finished July 1669 as well; Approb. 4 March 1670).

2. Giandomenico Gabiani, *Incrementa Sinicae Ecclesiae*, Viennae, 1673, p. 539.

3. *The Travels and Controversies of Friar Domingo Navarrete 1618–1686*, vol. 1 (The Hakluyt Society, no. 118), ed. by J.S. Cummins, p. 230.

was provided – at public cost – with *a second floor*, including twenty-five individual rooms in two rows on each floor, and with *common facilities* such as a chapel ("*sacellum*"), a refectory ("*triclinium*"), and an "*aula*".⁴ No 'library' is mentioned on this occasion. Among the furniture they purchased – again with the money they got from the local Governor – was – an important detail – a "*shelf for books*", made of cane, for the price of 1 "*ryal*", which was similar to the price of one table.⁵ As such, this enlarged residential building provided minimal accommodation to the 25 missionaries until their final release on 8 September 1671.⁶ When describing the difficult material conditions in which the Jesuits lived together in this compound, and which were confirmed by Giandomenico Gabiani (1623–1694) and François de Rougemont (1624–1676),⁷ the Dominican Friar Domingo de Navarrete (1618–1686) – one of the 'prisoners' – reported: "*In this confusion, we pass'd our time in Study and Prayer*".⁸ It is on this study and prayer that I would like to focus now.

Probably the best-known activity was the so-called '*Canton Conference*', spanning some 40 days between 18 December 1667 and 26 January 1668, under the presidency of Cheng Jili, i.e. Feliciano Pacheco, S.J., (1622–1687), the then provincial: following many intense discussions, 42 articles or resolutions were devised, known as the "*Acta Cantonensia*".⁹ Partly as a reaction on this, Navarrete composed a "*Declamatio*" which he presented on 8 March 1668 to the Jesuits; this was a heavy invective "against Chinese Rites and the policy used by the Jesuit missionaries with regard to the conversion of the Chinese": the entire rites controversy in a nutshell.

De Navarrete's text fuelled the polemic talents of several Jesuits present, and several 'apologies' or refutations were composed: by Prospero Intorcetta who finished a text on 15 August 1668; Francesco Brancati,

4. Gabiani, *Incrementa*, p. 581.

5. Navarrete, p. 230 Cummins.

6. Jean-Baptiste de Maldonado, in Pieter Visschers, *Onuitgegeven brieven van eenige Paters der Societeit van Jesus, Missionarissen in China, van de VIIde en XVIIIde eeuw, met aanteekeningen*, Arnhem, 1857, p. 12.

7. G. Gabiani, *Incrementa*, pp. 579–580; F. de Rougemont, *Historia Tartaro-Sinica Nova*, Lovanii, 1673, pp. 303/304.

8. Navarrete, p. 234 Cummins.

9. For the Chinese text with a complete French translation of the complete text, see H. Verhaeren, 'Ordonnances de la Sainte-Eglise', in: *Monumenta Serica*, 4, 1940, pp. 451–477; cf. also F. Bontinck, *La lutte autour de la liturgie chinoise aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*, Louvain, 1962, p. 120 ff.; Cummins, p. 413 ff.; J. Metzger, *Die Synoden in China, Japan und Korea 1570–1931*, Paderborn, 1980, p. 22 ff.

whose manuscript was finished on 4 September 1669 [Bertuccioli: 25 June]; and the professional theologian Jacques Le Faure (finished on July 1669; date of Approbation 4 March 1670); the autographs are now in Rome (*Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emanuele II* [BVE]: Fondo Gesuitico);¹⁰ afterwards they were printed in Paris (Pepie) in 1700, with some editorial modifications, of which some are relevant. What struck me when reading these texts in detail is the large number of references to Jesuit manuscript texts that were circulating and accessible in the residence, and to a series of Western books; this raises the question of the provenance of the sources, and the problem of the communication network behind it between the fathers under house arrest and the outside world. I will return to this basic point after my overview of the other achievements during the same period.

Indeed, almost simultaneous with this conference – in which all the fathers present participated – other projects, either individual or collective, were started or continued. The first of these was the epoch-making ‘*Confucius Translation Project*’. Started around 1660 by Ignacio da Costa, with the support of Prospero Intorcetta, a draft version of the translation of the four books was finished in one year, and the intention had been to have the whole text polished step by step¹¹. The initial result of this was the printing in 1662 of the translation of both the *Daxue* and the first parts of the *Lunyu* (Analects) under the overall title: “*Sapientia Sinica*”.¹² The persecution of 1664 had thwarted the continuation of this project, which was, however, resumed after the arrival in Canton; when some months after his arrival Da Costa died, Intorcetta took over the initiative until he left for Europe in September 1668. Since that time, the work of polishing and transcribing, in several copies, was continued by the Austrian Jesuit Christian Herdrich (*al.* Henriques), and two members of the Flemish–Belgian province, François de Rougemont and Philip Couplet, this after having dropped

10. The manuscript of Francesco Brancati is in BVE, FoGes., 1250/5; that of Prospero Intorcetta, *ibid.*, 1326; that of Jacques Lefauve *ibid.*, 1250/3.

11. This information stems from Intorcetta in a subsequently cancelled note in the ms of the *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus*, now in *Bibliothèque nationale de France* [BnF] (Ms. Lat., 6277/1 and 2). For a comparison of the ms. with the (much reduced) printed version, see my observations in: ‘The development of the *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* reconsidered in the light of new material’, in: R. Malek (ed.), *Western Learning and Christianity in China. The Contribution and Impact of John Adam Schall von Bell, s.j. (1592–1666)*, Monumenta Serica Monograph Series, XXXV/2, pp. 1141–1164.

12. *Sapientia Sinica*, exponents P(atre) Ignatio a Costa (...) & P(atre) Prospero Intorcetta (...) *Orbi Proposita*, Kien Cham in urbe Sinarum Provinciae Kiam Si, 1662.

the Mencius-part. Thanks to the correspondence of the Flemish fathers with their headquarters in the Flemish–Belgian region we can follow the stages of the work, including the deliberations on the editorial details (to whom should the work be dedicated? Who would write an introductory poem?). The last parcels were only shipped to Europe in April 1672.¹³ It is clear that this work of translation and polishing implied a thorough study of the basic Chinese texts and their commentaries, and the intensive manipulation of Chinese and Sino–European dictionaries, which is confirmed by a series of references in the aforementioned apologetic treatises simultaneously composed. In this process I suppose Christian Herdtrich (1625–1684) had an important part, as some 15 years later, when he died, he is called by his fellow-fathers one of the best ‘connoisseurs’ of Chinese, and was picked to finalise an overall ‘*novum vocabularium Latino–Sinicum*’, in which his colleagues put much confidence.¹⁴

Other, where specific projects were implemented at the same time as these activities. The first was the preparation of the rather enormous manuscript of Giandomenico Gabiani’s *Incrementum Sinicae Ecclesiae*. This is a continuous narrative report of what happened to the individual missionaries and their mission post since they were summoned to Peking; precisely for its topic the report was entirely made in Cantonese, using the oral witnesses of the missionaries present, and some written documents such as the personal diaries of Luigi Buglio (1606–1682) and Gabriel de Magalhães (1610–1677; p. 233); the ms. was completed in 1667 (Approbation Canton, 8 Dec. 1667).¹⁵

A parallel report was prepared by the French Jesuit Adrien Greslon (1618–1696), as we know from a letter by Philippe Couplet on 10 November 1666:¹⁶ this must be Greslon’s *Histoire de la Chine sous la domination des Tartars*, published in Paris in 1671. It mainly relied on the basis of letters sent to Canton by the three fathers in Peking (Ferdinand Verbiest, Gabriel de Magalhães and Luigi Buglio), and its

13. N. Golvers, ‘Confucius’, p. 1144.

14. Henri Josson & Léon Willaert, *Correspondance de Ferdinand Verbiest, Directeur de l’Observatoire de Pékin*, Brussels, 1938, p. 475.

15. The last related fact seems to be the death of Michael Trigault on 30 September 1667 (p. 606).

16. C.F. Waldack, in: *Analectes pour servir à l’histoire ecclésiastique de la Belgique*, 9, 1872, p. 21: “*alias fusissimas (relationes) alteram Latino idiomate per P(atrem) Gabianio, Gallico alteram per p(atrem) Adrianum Grelon, prelo dignissimam ex qua colliget Europa quam altis per 80 annos radices fixerit Christiana religio*”.

contents tally almost exactly with those of a long letter in Latin that Christian Herdrich wrote to Philip Miller (1613–1676), the Confessor of the Roman Emperor Leopold I (1640–1705) in Vienna, certainly through a common source or prototype.¹⁷ In addition, Greslon produced other long reports, such as the anonymous '*lettres annuelles of 1669*', of which Henri Bosmans has demonstrated Greslon was the writer,¹⁸ and a '*Suite de l'histoire de la Chine*', published in Paris in 1672; other letters in Brussels and Paris confirm that Greslon was indeed a prolific letter writer. These letters – and their immediate publication in France – prove that also during this period of detention, the communication route with Europe remained open. This can also be guessed of books, as the same Greslon apparently received from France an unidentified book against Jansenism.¹⁹

Another historical report was composed by François de Rougemont, which was published in Europe as *Historia Tartaro-Sinica Nova* in Lisbon, 1672 and in Louvain, 1673; the ms. was closed on 16 December 1668 (ibid. p. 327), although the Approbation was already signed on 7 October 1668.

Before, the same author had already composed – in his capacity as '*consultor*' – a Memorial to General Giampaolo Oliva, dated Canton, 1667, concerning some aspects of the Chinese Rites.²⁰ This is a report '*sui generis*', in which a curious attitude towards Western books is expressed, viz. the concern about the arrival of 'heretical' books ('*Calvini aliorumque haeresiarcharum libri*': p. 287). This text also contains an unexpected and clear reference to a Western book at hand, viz. Aeneas Piccolomini's *Historia Bohaemica*, ch. 13.

An important achievement was also the *French translation of Chinese medical texts*, published as a brochure and known under the

17. Previously in Cologne, in the Archiv der Norddeutschen Provinz S.J.; Abt. O., no. II, 12, 2, now in Munich, Archiv der Oberdeutschen Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu, with the same call number. For a comparative overview of the extant letters from this context: N. Golvers, *The Astronomia Europaea of Ferdinand Verbiest, S.J. (Dillingen, 1687)*. Monumenta Serica Monograph Series, vol. XXVIII, 1993, pp. 165–168.

18. In: *Annales de la Société d'Emulation de Bruges*, 62, 1912, pp. 19–22.

19. Pr. Intorcetta, Testimonium de cultu Sinensi: '*Iam legimus Apologiam Patrum Societatis contra Jansenium eiusque sectatores, quae Gallico idiomate typis mandata nunc extat in manibus Patris Adriani Grelon; in ea late haec calumnia contra nos late refertur*' (f. 65r. = p. 143 in the printed version).

20. The autograph is in BVE, FoGes. 1257/29, and the text was published by H. Bosmans, 'Documents relatifs à la Liturgie chinoise', in *Analecta Bollandiana*, 33, 1914, pp. 274–293 (cf. Bontinck, *La lutte autour de la liturgie chinoise*, pp. 113–120).

French title *Les secrets de la médecine des Chinois consistant en la parfaite connaissance du poulx*; printed by Philippe Charvys, bookseller etc. in Grenoble in 1671. As the very first dated 'European' publication on Chinese pulse diagnostics, the small booklet attracted the attention of the historians of Chinese and Western medicine, as noted by Mirko Grmek and, more recently, Eric Marié.²¹ In a preliminary note the anonymous author – better: translator – identifies himself as a French citizen ("*un Français amoureux de son Païs*") who was travelling through the world for 16 years, and was "*banny à Canton par sentence de la Cour de Pékin donnée il y a trois ans*".

With these clear but small indications, one can with certainty conclude that the French text was composed in the first years of the Canton banishment. On the other hand, so far no one has succeeded in identifying the author. Philippe Couplet (1622–1693) is not a plausible candidate, despite his declared interest in Chinese medical texts and his probable collaboration in the Latin translations of the *Specimen medicinae Chinensis*.²² Indeed, despite his French name he identifies himself in all situations as a 'Nederlander' – an inhabitant of the Dutch/Flemish speaking Low Countries, and certainly not a Frenchman, "*amoureux de son païs*". Therefore I am convinced that the author was one of the Jesuits with French nationality in Canton, either Jean Valat (1614–1696), Claude and Jacques Motel (1618–1671 and 1619–1692), Adrien Greslon, Humbert Augéry (1618–1673) or Jacques Le Faure (1613–1675). None of these had received – to my knowledge – any specific medical training, or they had been educated in a completely different sense (such as in the case of Lefaure, as a professional teacher-theologian), but this is not necessarily an obstacle to looking for the author among them, as the translator in the same introductory note refers to his own lack of knowledge of medical matters ("*le peu de connoissance que j'ay de cet art*").

This may refer more precisely to his minimal knowledge of 'university medicine', which does not exclude some 'practical' knowledge of other aspects of 'informal' medicine, as we know from several Europe-

21. Mirko Grmek, in: *Biologie médicale*, vol. LI, Févr. 1962 (Numéro hors série"); more recently Eric Marié, *Le diagnostic par le poulx en Chine et en Europe. Une histoire de la sphymologie des origines au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, 1911.

22. Cf. N. Golvers, 'Philippe Couplet, S.J. (1623–1693) and the Authorship of *Specimen Medicinae Sinensis* and some other Western writings on Chinese medicine', in *Medizinhistorisches Journal*, 2000, Heft 2, pp. 175–182.

an Jesuits in China, who acted as 'physicians', probably with the support of Chinese converts with (Chinese) medical training.²³ Anyway, if I may express some preferences – without having made yet more thorough verifications in the "*catalogi*" of the French provinces, – I would opt with some reservations for Humbert Augéry, a missionary with an almost unknown profile, but born in Vienne in the *Dauphiné*, which could explain why the brochure was published in Grenoble, capital of the same area.

To these compositions may in all probability be added the French–Chinese word list ("*dictionnaire Chinois & François*") published in the French edition of Athanasius Kircher, *La Chine d'Athanase Kircher de la Compagnie de Jesus, illustrée de plusieurs monuments tant sacrées que profanes* (...), Amsterdam: J. Jansson à Waesberghe, 1670, pp. 324–367, which is lacking in the original Latin edition (Amsterdam, 1667).²⁴ Therefore, it may have arrived in Europe, and probably in France between 1667 – the publication year of the original Latin edition – and 1670. The '*Dictionnaire*' has no author's name or other provenance indication, but I assume it is a copy of – or selection from – one of the bilingual Chinese-European word lists which were composed, or at least circulating in Canton during the Canton detention (1665–1671).²⁵ If the French version is the original one, and not a translation made in Europe after its arrival, the author may have been one of the French Jesuits present on the spot. The assumption that it was shipped from Canton to France in the second half of the 1660s is not danger-

23. Such were François de Rougemont and Francesco Brancati: see N. Golvers, *François de Rougemont, missionary in Ch'ang-shu (Chiang-nan). A Study of the Account Book (1674–1676) and the Elogium*. Louvain Chinese Studies, VII, Louvain, 1999, pp. 529–540.

24. For a partial photograph: H. Walravens, *China Illustrata. Das europäische Chinaverständnis im Spiegel des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts*, Wolfenbüttel, 1987, p. 97.

25. Cf., a.o., J. Lefauve, in Canton 1669, in *De Sinensium Ritibus* (ms. BVE, FoGes., 1250/3, f° 235r./print [Paris, 1700], p. 425): "*sum hien*" offeruntur, atque in iisdem ipsis discis seu lancibus quos *vocabularia Europaeo-Sinica* appellant '*vasa sacrificii* (sic)'; ibid., f° 244v. (p. 457/8 of the print): "*Scimus quae voces in vocabulariis Europaeo-Sinicis strictius usurpatae sint, quae vero latius, defectu proprii vocabuli Sinico respondentis, in rebus quae vel supra Sinarum captum posita, vel procul a nostro modo loquendi modo dissitae sunt*". Similar "*vocabularia Sinoeuropaea*" are also described at length by Filippucci, in the ms. of his *Praeludium* (Macao, 1682: cf. BVE, FoGes., 1249/7 f° 411v.; print [Paris: 1700] pp. 64–65), stressing their incomplete and imperfect character, due to the particularity of Chinese characters, which need a context to be exactly understood: "*illa (sc. Vocabularia) quidem non esse numeris omnibus absoluta, nec (ut linguam et literas Sinicas apprime callentibus videtur) omnino perfecte fieri ullo modo posse; ratio est, quia Europaeae voces, ut plurimum vel unam aut paucas, et determinatas habent significationes; Sinicae vero litterae, si solitariae sumantur, plerumque plurimas habent, et saepe indeterminatas et contrarias significationes; si complexim cum aliis inveniuntur, multa plura significant, et saepe saepius (sic) a singulari litterae significatione longissime disparatae*".

ous, as we have seen with regard to the letters written by, among others, Adrien Greslon in Canton, which did arrive in France, and were published in... 1670 (see the aforementioned *Histoire*).

These examples suffice to demonstrate that this five year stay was indeed spent to a large part on "study and prayer" (to repeat the words of Navarrete). On the one hand, the prayer supposes the presence of prayer books and the shared meals were – acc. to both Navarrete and Couplet – 'adorned' with the public reading of pious/edifying texts, "Spanish and Portuguese books, the Martyrology in Spanish, or the manuscripts of Antonio de Gouveia."²⁶ On the other hand, it was especially the "study" which presupposes the presence of books and manuscripts. Whereas writing on contemporary history would not (necessarily) have required the presence of many books, the composition of the apologies – in a scholastic tradition – would hardly have been possible without access to, and permanent consultation of a series of documents, manuscript texts and printed books, both Chinese and Western. A relative wealth of them is also mentioned scattered throughout the mss. and printed texts composed there: Chinese texts of Confucian classics and commentaries, together with the aforementioned 'word-list' and 'dictionaries'.

In addition, an entire series of other manuscripts circulated: the most spectacular examples were probably the manuscripts of Antonio de Gouveia of the treatises *Monarchia Sinica* and *Asia Extrema* (Int., p. 204, 293; LF, p. 433). Still other manuscripts are mentioned in the parallel Apologies of Francesco Brancati (Bra.), Prospero Intorcetta (Int.) and Jacques Le Faure (LF): manuscript texts of Inacio da Costa (Int., p. 29; since the latter's death on 11 May 1666 in the possession of Gabiani), Caballero de Santa Maria (Intorcetta, p. 298), Francisco Furtado (Lefaure, p. 287), Giandomenico Gabiani (viz. the draft of the *Incrementa Sinicae Ecclesiae*: cf. LF, p. 31/32; f° 150v.), Niccolo Longobardo (Int., p. 203 a.o.; Jacques Lefaure, p. 143/4) and Paschasius Mendez (LF, p. 143/4). These manuscripts apparently circulated freely between the Fathers present, and most of them had a later reception, in China and in Europe: in addition to the aforementioned apologies, which were in 1700 printed in Europe Gabiani's ms. (certainly brought

26. Test. in Navarrete, p. 233 and Couplet, JS 164, f° 158v; confirmed by a reference to the same ms by J. Lefaure, in *De Sinensium Ritibus Politicis Acta*, ms. BVE, FoGes. 1250/3, f° 239r./printed version (Paris, 1700), p. 434.

to Europe by Pr. Intorcetta), and especially De Gouveia's manuscripts, were much used and abused: read during the 'public readings in the refectory' (cf. above), parts of them were also 'pirated' by Domingo de Navarrete – as Ph. Couplet found out when he returned to Europe,²⁷ and other parts were the basis of an anonymous manuscript continuation of Ricci-Trigault's *De Expeditione Sinica*, now in the central archives of the Society of Jesus in Rome (ARSI), the heir of the former *Tabularium* of the General.²⁸ Niccolo Longobardo's 1623 manuscript, titled *Resposta breve sobre las Controversias do Xamti Tienxin Limhoan e otros nomes e termos Sinicos* (...) also circulated in this milieu, and came in to the hands of D. de Navarrete, who translated the remnants in Spanish, and inserted them in his *Tratados*.²⁹

Of course, many Chinese texts and manuscripts, including letters, were also to be found there; quite revealing is a passage in Lefauré's mss., where he describes in telling terms his work with Chinese texts, browsing through the volumes ("*indefessa pervolutione librorum*") during intense discussions:

Nobis tandem aliquando unâ cum V(estri)s P(atri)bus indefessâ librorum pervolutione et creberrimâ litteratorum cuiuslibet ordinis ac religionis consuetudine concessum est rerum penetralia ingredi, et minutissima quaeque rimando dignoscere, etc. 'Finally, we were once allowed, together with Your Fathers, through the indefatigable manipulation of books and a very frequent inter-course/conversation with the 'literati' of whatever order and

27. JS 164, f° 158–159, Madrid, 26 May 1689 (to Tirso Gonzalez): "*Quod spectat ad opera P(atris) Antonii de Gouveia (quae dedicari possent Duci d'Aveiro) mihi constat fuisse examinata in China, et quidem Monarchia Sinica lecta fuit in refectorio nostri Cantonsiensis, praesente P(atre) Navarrete, qui ex eâ descripsit quae in 1â tomo suo inseruit, etc.*" (the rest of the passage refers to De Gouveia's request to Couplet to take care of the publication, giving him the right to change/omit whatever would be necessary).

28. JS 107: N. Trigault, A. Gouveia, *Historia Missionis Sinensis 1610–1625. Progressus & Incrementum Fidei ac Christianae Religionis apud Sinas seu Proseutio Annalium Sinensium Societatis Jesu Rev(erendi) Patris Nicolai Trigaultii a Morte R(everendi) P(atris) Matthaei Riccii ad nostra usque tempora concinnata, maxime ex commentariis R(everendi) P(atris) Antonii de Govea eiusdem Societatis Jesu*" (the intermediary person, and the author of this continuation may be Martino Martini).

29. More precisely in *Tratados*, vol. I, pp. 245–289, this according to Kilian Stumpf in 1701, in his ms. *Tractatus contra Historiam cultus: "Postremo R.P. Nicolaus Longobardi, S.J. in China missionarius, in tractatu, qui extat linguâ Hispanicâ apud Ill(ustrissimum) Navarretem tom/I, p. 246 hac de re professus disputans fuse ostendit Sinas litterariae sectae addictas, verum Deum non agnoscere, et nomine Coeli seu Xam ti caelum materiale a quo res omnes inferiores dependent intellegere"* (ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico, 724/5, p. 40: "7ma Probatio ex patre Longobardo").

religion, to enter to the core of things and to discern by examining the smallest details thorough investigation'.³⁰

This creates the impression of a real 'collection', if not 'library' in which they found large quantities of papers; this explains also such expressions as "some days ago I fell on a (Chinese) book" (Lefauure),³¹ which even suggests they had no real overview, nor probably any inventory or catalogue of the entire collection, due to the 'hazardous' character of this collection, destined to remain temporary.

Returning now to the initial situation, with the Jesuits arriving in the night in an empty residence, this raises the question of where all these books and manuscripts, Chinese and European alike, came from. The question is the more 'dramatic' as all the manuscripts produced in Canton contain a wealth of precise quotations to European works, including numerical references, which is in apparent contradiction with the statement of Lefauure, who in the final paragraphs of his ms. Apologises for being almost completely destitute of European books:

(...) quod ab homine Europaeis libris [ac membranis] ipsâque D(ivi) Thom(ae) Summâ destituto (eo nos inopîae pe<r>secutio redegit), ex recordatione rerum quas ante annos circiter viginti tractaveram, quasi tenuissimae quaedam et prope iam emortuae praeteritorum temporum reliquiae prodierint / 'because I am a man destitute of European books and parchments (i.e. manuscripts), even (a copy of) the Summa of Divine Thomas (into such poverty the persecution had brought us!) I published very thin and almost dead remnants of former times from my recollection of the topics, which I had treated about twenty years ago'.³²

By its formulation, this statement, which dates back to July 1669, seems to rule out almost completely the presence of a *Western book collection* in Canton, especially in the field of theological and canonical books. Moreover, it seems to corroborate another statement, made by

30. BVE, 1250/3, f° 244v.

31. Lefauure, p. 112 (ms. f° 167r): "Ante paucos dies incidi in librum ab emerito Praetore civico & doctore Sinico, cui nomen Ho elaboratum".

32. See his ms in BVE, FoGes. 1250/3, f° 245v. cf. the printed edition, [Paris, 1700], p. 461.

G. Gabiani who, writing in the same context, echoes a similar situation in the field of astronomy and calendars, where the absence of the appropriate books prevented a comparative appreciation of Chinese and Western historical records on eclipses:

Nobis quidem, debitis librorum subsidiis carentibus, tam gravi dubitationi elucidandae modus non suppetit / 'however, we did not have the opportunity to disentangle such heavy doubts, as we lacked the support of the necessary (i.e. the appropriate) books'.

The explanation of this ambiguous situation has to be differentiated, and is to be found in a composite situation.

First, for the *Chinese manuscripts* and the documents produced before the trial in China: as it is rather improbable that the Jesuits had taken them to the trial in Peking, and from there to Canton, I suppose these were provided by their Chinese assistants and visitors, who – either by letters³³ or by their physical visits – continued the contact with their mission, and their regional basis, and of whom we catch echoes in the Cantonese documents of this time. Only in this way can I understand that, for instance, Francesco Brancati refers to one of the letters he got from Francesco Bardi in Palermo, in his possession during his stay in Canton,³⁴ although Bardi had died in 1661, i.e. several years before the Canton detention started.

As for an entire series of *Jesuit documents, letters and other archival materials alike*, it has been proven in the past that these were brought over from the Macau Jesuit college by Chinese “*moços*”. Indeed, even the entire archives of the college were transferred to Canton.³⁵

33. Chinese written letters to Intorcetta: p. 183 (“4 aut 5 eiusdem Lini [from Hangzhou] epistolae”); cf. Lefauve, p. 40: “*Sinus* (i.e. *Linus*) scilicet litteris in sacra Lanki aede ad Patrem F. Brancati datis...”.

34. Brancati, ms. f° 356r.: “*Consului ego P(atrem) Franciscum Bardi studiorum praefectum in universitate Collegii Panormitani super his Confucianis ritibus, qui etiam alios theologos consuluit, mihi que sic respondit, etc.*”

35. For the transfer of documents, see J. Dehergne, ‘Un dossier bibliographique de la fin du XVIII^e siècle sur la question des termes chinois’, in: *Recherches des sciences religieuses*, 36, 1949, pp. 25–79 (the quoted statement is on p. 27: “*Pour utiliser les loisirs forcés de 5 années et plus [i.e. between 25 mars 1666–1671], ils firent venir de Macau les archives conservés au Collège de la Compagnie de Jésus*”; unfortunately, thus far I have not found the source of this important testimony).

36. See ‘Uma resurreição histórica’, in: *Ta-ssi-yang-kuo – Archivos y Annaes do Extremo Oriente Portuguez*, 1901 etc., passim (a.o. part IV, p. 305 (Francisco Moço of Lubelli with letters etc.)).

That the intermediaries were Chinese "*moços*" is not only the most plausible assumption, but is also confirmed by an annotation in the simultaneous diary of Luis de Gama, at that time residing in Macau, who mentions their passage from Macau to Canton and vice versa,³⁶ and how they brought letters in both directions,³⁷ except during a short interruption in the Macau-Canton contacts in 1667.³⁸

But what about the rather heavy references to *Western books* in the apologies, also in Lefauere, despite his own complaint on being destitute of Western books? The solution to this may be complex.

First, I suppose we have to take a certain amount of exaggeration into account.

There emerges another possible explanation: Lefauere might have used an '*aide-mémoire*', in the form of a personal collection of annotations and quotations, which this ancient theology professor at the University of Bourges might have brought to China. This assumption 'ad hoc' does not solve, however, why also Brancati and, to a lesser extent, Intorcetta adduced – though to a lesser extent, within the framework of their refutation, Western authorities and references. Therefore, I prefer an explanation, that would solve the problem for the three authors together, and this does not have to advocate the effect of an alleged personal notebook of Lefauere.

This solution might have consisted in an hypothetical *temporary loan in Macau of specific, selected books from the well-furnished Jesuit library*. The conditions for this assumption seem to have been realised, when, after a while, the detention regime was mitigated, and mutual contacts between the two Jesuit stations were possible. As a substantial

37. Another running correspondence was that between Navarrete and Antonio de Gouveia (BVE, FoGes. 1252/5 [1669]). 1. Navarrete to de Gouveia: 29.XII.1669; answer of the latter, Canton 1 Oct. 1669 (sic); concerning Chinese rites, with reference to the discussions in Hangzhou, in 1642; also references to *Martyrologium Romanum*, accepted by Roman theologians in 1640; on Dec. 25, the world chronology is explained: 5199 jaar after the Creation, 2957 years after the Deluge, 2015 after the birth of Abraham, etc.; 2. Answer of de Gouveia, of 3 Oct. 1669; he mentions having seen a copy of Navarrete.

38. For 1667, some sources indeed refer to 'broken' contacts between Canton and Macau: see Munich BayHptSta., Jes. 590, no. 12 (N. Sotwell to L. Mancini): "*Accepimus literas e Sinis anni 1667 ex Macau (...). Exortâ discordiâ gravi inter magistratum Cantoniensem et Macaensem, prohibitum est ad tempus commercium omne cum Macaensibus, ita ut haec civitas redacta fuerit ad maximas angustias et impedita permutatio personarum inter nostros (!)*" / "In 1667 we received letters from China, more precisely from Macau. Because serious discord had broken out between the magistrates of Canton and of Macau, every exchange of letters with the inhabitants of Macau had temporarily been forbidden, in such a way that this city (of Canton) was brought to very great penury, and the mutual exchange (contact) of persons among us is obstructed'.

exchange happened with the archives (cf. above), it seems to be equally acceptable to surmise similar exchange for the books needed for the refutation of de Navarrete's *Declamatio* as well.

Finally, in addition, and at random, we also hear of *new books arriving from Europe*. One example is a – still unidentified – printed ‘reply’ to the Jansenist anti-Jesuit polemics, published in French (in France or Holland?), which in 1668 was (or came into) in the possession of the French Adrien Greslon, we don’t know how.³⁹

In conclusion: this Canton episode is not only a revealing case of ‘intellectual concentration’ of the mission, and the cradle of a series of editorial activities, of which some became ‘epoche-making’, but also an interesting test case for reflecting on the routes and forms of communication the Jesuits ‘exploited’ within China, from China with Macau, and from this area with the European basis, also in critical situations, thus creating the necessary conditions for them to continue their missionary and scholarly work.

39. Intorcetta, in BVE, FoGes. 1326, f° 65r. [written before August 1668]; cf. edition of Paris (Pepié, 1700), p. 143: *Quondam iam legimus Apologiam Patrum Societatis contra Jansenium eiusque sectatores, quae Gallico idiomate typis mandata nunc extat in manibus Adriani Grelon; in ea haec calumnia contra nos lata refertur* / ‘We already have read the Apology for the Fathers of the Jesuits against Jansenius and his adherents [i.e. the Jansenists], which was printed in French, and is now in the hands of Father (Adrien) Grelon; in this Apology the author refers to these calumnies against us’.

Appendix

Western printed books mentioned in the same Apologies are:

- Anon., “*Gangrensis in 6. Synodo Gener(al)i Constantinop(olitano) in Trullo*”: LF, f° 150r. (p. 28);
- Anon., *Historia Provinciae Manilanae S. Rosarii Praedicatorum*: Bra., , f° 325v. (I, p. 4); Adrianus, *Tract. de Bapt.*, 4: LF, f° 157r./p. 62;
- Ambrosius, (*De*) *Off(iciis) Ministrorum Libri* 3, viz. lib. 1, ch. 5: Bra., f° 326 (I, p. 6); Ambrosius, (*Expositio*) in *Psalm. 118*: Bra., f° 470r./v. (II, p. 318);
- Ambrosius, *In Lucam*, l. 9: Bra., f° 382r.(II, p. 7/8);
- Anacletus Papa, cap. 2: LF, f° 201r. : p. 274;
- Aristotle, in *Rhetor.*; Bra., f° 342r. (I, p. 77);
- Augustinus, *Civitate Dei*, 5, c. 8: LF, f° 172r./p. 143/4; *ibid.*, lib. 10, c. 3: LF, f° 193v./p. 244; *ibid.*, lib. 10, c. 19: LF, f° 190v./p. 229; *ibid.*, lib. 1(0), c. 19: LF, f° 156v./p. 59; *ibid.*, lib. 10, c. 19: Bra., f° 346r. (I, p. 94); *ibid.*, lib. 11, cap. 5: LF, f° 196v./p. 257/8;
- Augustinus, *Confessiones*, lib. 6, c. 11: LF, f° 242v./p. 449; *ibid.*, lib. 6, c. 64: Bra., f° 392r.(II, p. 47);
- Augustinus, *Contra Faustum*, lib. 20: LF, f° 205v./p. 296;
- Augustinus, *De Cura pro Mortuis Gerenda*: Bra., f° 474r. (II, p. 321);
- Augustinus, *De Doctrina Christiana*, l. 2, c. 20, co(ntrov.) 3: Bra., f° 345r. (I, p. 88/89); etc.;
- Augustinus, *Epistulae*: LF, f° 184r./p. 200; *Epist. 118*, c. 3: LF, f° 242v./p. 448;
- Augustinus, *Quaestiones super Genesim*, l. 1, q. 16: LF, f° 228v./p. 399;
- Augustinus, *Sententia de Gen(esi?)*, cap. 4: LF, f° 167v./p. 114;
- Augustinus, *Quaestiones in Lib(erum) Iudicium*, l. 1: LF, f° 228v./p. 397;
- Augustinus, *Sermo 5 de Sanctis*: LF, f° 211r./p. 318: Bra., f° 421v. (II, p. 164);
- Augustinus, *Sermo 25 “in Matth(aeum)”*: LF, f° 155v./p. 52;

- Averroes, *doctus commentator*: LF, f° 166r./p. 105;
- Baronius, *Annales Eccl(esiastici)*, ad ann(um) 397: LF, f° 242v./p. 449;
- Baronius, *Epitome*, num. 36 (ad ann. 44): LF, f° 243v./p. 452/3);
- Busenbaum: Bra., f° 418v. (II, p. 146);
- Bzovius, *in suis Gallicis Annalibus*, t. 14: Bra., f° 419v./420r. (II, p. 155–156);
- Caietano, “in 3(tia) p(arte), q. 77, art. 1”: LF, f° 157v./p. 64;
- Caietano, “q(uaestio) 36, art. 4”: Bra., f° 356r. (I, p. 134/5);
- Calepinus, *Dictionarium*: Bra., f° 382r. (I, p. 7/8);
- Chrysostomus, *Homil.* 16: LF, f° 150r./p. 30;
- Cicero, *De Divinatione*, l. 1: LF, f° 172r./p. 143/4;
- Cicero, *De domo suâ*, 51 (131): Bra., f° 382r. (II, p. 7/8): “*Curia sedes ac templum publici consilii*”; cf. Nizolius, p. 1187, s.v. *Templum*, with reference to another text subdivision: “*Pro Domo 139b*”; LF, f° 205r./p. 291;
- Cicero, (*de Inventione*, II, 161): Bra., f° 335r. (I, p. 50): “*Veritas est per quam immutata...dicuntur*”;
- Cicero, *de Oratore*, l. 2 (more precisely II.159 [38]): Bra., f° 356r. (I, p. 147): “*non aurificis staterâ...examinare*”. Cf. Nizolius, p. 1122, s.v. *Trutina* and p. 1137, referring to another edition (“123a”);
- Cicero, *Tusc(ulanae) Disp(utationes)*, l. 5: Int., f° 91r./v. (p. 246): “*igitur est homini cum Deo cognatio et similitudo*”; I could not trace this passage, which is very similar to another one in *de leg.* I, 25 (“*est igitur homini cum deo similitudo; quod cum ita sit, quae tandem esse potest proprior certiorve cognatio?*”);
- Concilium Eliberinum*, can. 60: LF, f° 243r./p. 451;
- Concilium Tridentinum*: LF, f° 228v./p. 397;
- Gabiani, G., ms. of *Incrementa*: LF, f° 150v./p. 32;
- Gaius: Bra., f° 342r. (I, p. 77/8);
- Govea/Gouveia, Antonio de, *Monarchia Sinica* (ms.): LF, f° 239r./p. 433;
- Gregorius Magnus, *Can.(?)*, dist. 45: LF, f° 243r./p. 450/1;
- Gregorius Magnus, *Re (prae-)scriptum ad Augustinum Angliae Apostolum*: Lefauve, f° 242v./p. 447;
- Gregorius, (*Epistula*) *Bonifatio Episc(opo) Neapolitano*: Bra., f° 466v. (II, p. 291/2);
- Gregorius Theologus, *Orat.* 32: LF, f° 245v./p. 460;

- Hieronymus, *Epistulae*: LF, f° 184r./p. 200; *Epist.*, 126 "ad Euagrium": LF, f° 201r./p. 274;
- Hieronymus, *Sententia*: LF, f° 153r./p. 46;
- Hilarius, (*Commentarium*) in *Matth(aeum)*, 6: Bra., f° 334r. (I, p. 43);
- Hurtado, Thomas, *Liber Resol(utionum) Mor(alium) Tract(atus) Ultimus* (= *Resolutionum moralium: de residentia sacra ibri XII*): Bra., f° 326r. etc. (I, p. 5, etc.);
- Layman, *De Sacrificio Missae*, tract. 5: Bra., f° 386v. (II, p. 25);
- Layman, *De Vitiis Oppositis Virtuti Religionis* (= *Theologia Moralis*, lib. 4: "de virtute et statu religionis"?), c. 2, p. 734: Bra., f° 388v. (II, p. 36);
- Layman, (*Theologia Moralis*), lib. 1, tract. 4, cap. 24: LF, f° 191r./p. 231; *ibid.*, lib. 4, tract. 10: Bra., f° 356r. (I, p. 134/5); f° 418v. (II, p. 146); LF, f° 157r./p. 61;
- Lessius, *varii loci*, without exact reference: LF, f° 156v./p. 59; f° 157r./p. 60;
- Lipsius: Bra., f° 342r. (I, pp. 77/8), etc.;
- Luc/go, Juan de, *De Eucharistiae Sacrificio*: LF, f° 192r./p. 240; *ibid.*, disp. 19, sect. 1, num. 12: *ibid.*, f° 193v./p. 243;
- Lyra, Nic. de, *Glossa Ordinaria*: "ad id quod Glossa ordinaria notat apud Liv. (corrected in the print: Lyr.) de regibus Babiloniae Belo et Nino, etc."; cf. Int., f° 6 (p. 8);
- Maffei, Giov. Petr., *Historia Indica*, l. 6: LF, f° 200v./p. 271/2;
- Marini, G.F. de, *Methodus Doctr(inae) Societ(atis) apud Sinas, Proem(ium) ad Lect(orem)*;
- Martini, M., *Novus Atlas Sinensis*: passim, a.o. Bra., f° 383v. (II, p. 13); Int., f° 14v./p. 44 ff.; LF, p. 373 (all concerning the term "gymnasium");
- Metodo della dottrina che i Padri della Compagnia di Giesu insegnano a Neofitti nelle Missione della Cina*, Lione, 1665): Bra., f° 326r. (I, p. 5/6);
- Mendez, Paschasius, p. 29: LF, f° 172v. /144;
- Moralez, "in rescripto quod ad ipsius postulata dedit S(acra) Congregatio": LF, f° 150r./p. 29; cf. also s.v. Rubinus;
- Nicolaus Papa, *ad Nicolaum Imperatorem*: LF, f° 201r./p. 274;
- Optatus Milevitanus, *Epistolae*: LF, f° 184r./p. 200;
- Pantoja, Did.: LF, f° 163r./p. 85;
- Paulinus, *Ad Alesium* (?): LF, f° 242v./p. 449;

- Porphyrius impius (commentator): LF, f° 166r./p. 105;
 Quintilianus, *Inst(itutio) Orat(oria)*, 4.2.94: Bra., f° 340r. (I, p. 68):
 “*quorundam probatio sola sit...perseverantia*”;
 Ribadeneira, Pedro de, *Flos Sanctorum*: Bra., f° 413r. (p. 147/8);
 Int., f° 95v./p. 265 (“*in ipsius Gregorii festo*”); f° 97r./269
 (“*verba ipsa, quae in Vita Divi Gregorii fol. 241 refert*”); f° 97v./
 p. 272 (which feast and edition were used?);
 Ricci, Matth.: cf. s.v. Trigault;
 Rubino, A. & Morales: Bra., f° 327r. (I, p. 9); LF, f° 153r./p. 47;
 Rupertus, *In Genesim*, lib. 5, cap. 12: LF, f° 201r./p. 274;
 Salmasius (Saumaise), *In Epictetum*: Int., f° 91r./p. 246;
 Sanchez de Cienpoçuelos, Gaspar: Bra., f° 356r. (I, p. 135);
 Sanchez, Th.: LF, f° 211r./p. 318;
 Smedo, Alvaro: LF, f° 163r./p. 85;
 Seneca, *De beneficiis*, l. 8, to be corrected into lib. 3.1.3 (“*Ingratus est...*”): Bra., f° 343r. (I, p. 82);
 Seneca, *Epist.* 96: Int., f° 91r./p. 246: “*Homo est res sacra*”; in fact
 to be found in in *Epist.* 95 (33): “*Homo, sacra res homini*”;
 Suarez, *Contra regem Angliae*: LF, f° 156r. and 228v. (p. 55 and 397:
 “l. 2, c. 5, n. 4”); Bra., f° 419r. (II, p. 147/8: “l. 2, c. 5, n. 4”); Int.,
 f° 94v./p. 7/8 (“l. 2, c. 12, n. 9”);
 Suarez, *De Defensione Fidei*, l. 2, cap. 12: LF, f° 228v./p. 397; lib. 2,
 c. 4, n. 5: LF, f° 156r./p. 55;
 Suarez, *De Legibus*, lib. 9, disp. 4: LF, f° 157r./p. 62; lib. 7: *ibid.*,
 f° 160r./p. 76;
 Symmachus, *Apologia adversus Anastasium Imperatorem*: LF,
 f° 156r./p. 55;
 Tertullianus; *Lib. de Idolis*, cap. 16: LF, f° 161r./p. 76;
 Thomas a Kempis, *De Imitatione Christi*: Int., f° 6r./p. 15;
 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologia*, varii loci, quoted by Bra., Int.
 and LF (cf. Repertory);
 Trigault, Nic., *De Expeditione Sinica (sic)*, lib. 1, cap. 4: LF: f° 211v./p.
 324; *ibid.*, l. 3 (print: 5!): LF, f° 175r./p. 161. On Trigault’s dependency
 on M. Ricci’s original version, see *id.*, f° 163r./p. 85: “*ex mente et codi-
 cibus Patris Mathaei Riccii*”;
 Ulpianus: Bra., f° 342r. (I, p. 77/8);
 Vasquez, 1.2ae disp. 182, c. 5: LF, f° 157r./p. 62;
 Vergilius, *Aeneis*, l. 2: Bra., f° 382r. (II, p. 7/8); to be corrected into *Aen.*

lib. 4, vv. 457-58: "*Praeterea fuit in tectis (...) coniugis antiqui*"; Zacharias Pontifex, *Responsum ad Bonifatium*: LF, f° 242r./p. 447.

Compared to the three apologies or refutations excerpted here, the other texts which the Jesuits composed during the Canton detention for a Western public contain comparatively few references to Western sources. This can easily be understood from their particular contents, which offered almost no occasion for using Western books. So, the few references to Western books in the *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (CSPH) – the main publication prepared in this period – may certainly be due to the exclusively Neo-Confucianist contents. It is no surprise that the only references appear precisely in the long *Declaratio Proëmialis*,⁴⁰ composed by Ph. Couplet and sent from Canton to Europe up to 1672:⁴¹ mentioned there are such not uncommon authorities as Lactantius (on p. LVIII; LXXV; LXXXIII; XCIII of the printed version), Thomas Aquinas (p. LXIX) and Caietanus, cap. II.V.1 (p. LXXIV), but also Michel Servet, with his "6th letter to Calvinus" certainly a less common author, and therefore more significant. Finally, the almost complete absence of references to Western books in the other manuscripts prepared in Canton can be understood from their character as reports on the contemporary mission history in China.

On this point, it is of great importance to stress that my check of the manuscript versions of all the texts mentioned has demonstrated that the references are all in the autograph manuscript, either integrated into the current text corpus or put in the margin, but always written in the same hand; the references, in consequence, are part of the original text and were not added afterwards. This not only holds for the 1668/1669 Apologies – the manuscripts of which are now in

40. CSPH, pp....

41. That the progressive dispatch to Europe was ongoing in 1672 appears from a reference in the letter of J.B. Maldonado, of 15 April 1672 (publ. by H. Bosmans, in ASHEB, 35, 1910, p. 81): "*Mitto ad R(everentiam) V(estram) partem declarationis proaemialis ad Opus Confucianum. Ob temporis brevitatem sex ultima capita describi non potuere; sed statim mittam, per alteram viam, plenam, et illa sex capita per tertiam viam, ut V(estra) R(everentia) quoquo modo declarationem integram habeat*" / "I send Y.R. [i.e. Pr. Intorcetta, then in Europe] hereby part of the Introductory Declaration to the work on Confucius. For brevity of time, the last six chapters could not yet be transcribed; but I will send the whole Declaration as soon as possible via another way, and these six chapters via a third way [i.e. in a third copy], in order that Y.R. will have, in whatever way, the entire Declaration'.

BVE⁴² – but I could establish the same during my twofold check of the manuscript of the Confucius texts in Paris (BnF).⁴³ It seems therefore completely legitimate to assume – as it does for the other similar cases discussed in Peking – that these titles too represent books on hand in the Canton Jesuit residence, which by their number constituted a small library.

42. For the Brancati-ms. (BVE, FoGes., 1250/5), the oldest quotations go back to Macau, 1683, where the ms was located at that time, according to F.-X. Filippucci, who used the ms. during his stay there for the composition of his own *De Ritibus Sinicis* (BVE, FoGes., 1248 / 3; cf. two literal references to Brancati *ibid.* f° 301v.–302r. (cf. sub 4.1.1).

43. The ms is in BnF, Ms. lat. 6277/1 and 6277/2; I presented a physical description of this ms for the first time in my article in the A. Schall volume; I made a second revision in June 2006, with particular interest in the question of the references. During this revision, I could establish that the original text of the *Declaratio* was also dated “80 years” after the beginning of the Jesuit mission in China (see Ms. 6277/1, f° 1, l and 5 lXr.), i.e. ca. 1666, i.e. also the date of the letter that Intorcetta had addressed to the future candidates of the mission (p. VIII–IX v.); the number “80” had afterwards been cancelled and substituted by “100”, corresponding to 1686, the year that the revision of the ms. started, in view of its publication in Paris.